UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/606,439	06/26/2003	Subodh K. Raniwala	006943.00395	2930	
	7590 11/29/200 YITCOFF, LTD.	7	EXAMINER		
and ATTORNEYS FOR CLIENT NO. 006943 10 SOUTH WACKER DR.			ELOSHWAY, NIKI MARINA		
SUITE 3000	ACKER DK.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO, IL	60606		3781		
•					
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/29/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
•	10/606,439	RANIWALA, SUBOI	RANIWALA, SUBODH K.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Niki M. Eloshway	3781			
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence add	ress		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statt Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the main earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a not will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO nute, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this com BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10	September 2007.				
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ Th	nis action is non-final.				
, —	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under	r Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.I). 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>30-43 and 58-68</u> is/are pending in t 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdom 5)☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>30-38,41,43,58,60-63 and 65-67</u> is/ 7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>39, 40, 42, 59, 64, 68</u> is/are objected 8)☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration. /are rejected. ed to.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) and a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct of the oath or declaration is objected to by the second	ccepted or b) objected to ne drawing(s) be held in abeya ection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application 			

10/606,439 Art Unit: 3781

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 30-38, 41, 43, 58, 60-63 and 65-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones (U.S. 5,522,155) in view of Zingle et al. (U.S. 5,596,814). Jones teaches a container 1, 10 having a body 1 and a closure 10. The closure has a through going hole 14, with a hydrophobic membrane 30 secured to the inner end and an air tight seal closing the outer end.

Jones teaches the claimed invention except for the air tight seal being permanently attached. Zingle et al. teach that it is known to provide a container with an air tight seal which is permanently attached to the closure by a coating (see col. 5 lines 41-46). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the container of Jones with the air tight seal being permanently attached to the closure by a coating, as taught by Zingle et al., in order to prevent venting once initial venting is complete.

Regarding claims 31, 61 and 67, Jones teaches the claimed invention except for the air tight seal terminating flush with the outer surface of the closure. Zingle et al. teach that it is known to provide a container with an air tight seal which terminates flush with the outer surface of the closure (see element 24 which is seated within element 22 of the closure). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the container of Jones with the air tight seal

10/606,439

Art Unit: 3781

terminating flush with the outer surface of the closure, as taught by Zingle et al., in order to securely fasten the seal within the opening and prevent unintentional removal of the seal.

Regarding claim 37, it further would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the container of Jones with the hole being between 50 and 100 microns, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 39, 40, 42, 59, 64 and 68 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, 3. but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The new grounds of rejection were necessitated by the amendment filed September 10, 2007.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office 5. action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing

Application/Control Number:

10/606,439

Art Unit: 3781

date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH

shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action

is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX

MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to Niki M. Eloshway whose telephone number is 571-272-4538. The examiner can normally

be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Anthony Stashick can be reached on 571-272-4561. The fax phone number for the organization where

this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained

from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available

through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer

Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR

CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NiKi M. Eloshway

Examiner

Art Unit 3781

nme

ANTHONY D. STASHICK SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 4

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700